

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application.

In the Office Action, claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for an informality. Claim 13, as well as claims 2 and 10, are amended for non-statutory reasons, e.g., to correct the informality. The claims are not narrowed in scope and no new matter is added. Accordingly, claim 13 now complies with 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 12-13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,799,859 (Ida), and rejects claims 1-11 and 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over JP 2001-066547 (Baba) taken with Ida. It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-20 are patentable over Ida and Baba for at least the following reasons.

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 12 is no longer allowable since it did not included the feature of intervening claims 10 and 2. In response, claim 12 has been amended to include the features of (intervening) claims 10 and 2. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that independent claim 12 be allowed. In addition, as claim 13 depends from independent claim 12, Applicant respectfully requests that claim 13 also be allowed.

Claims 1-11 and 14-20 are patentable over Ida and Baba at least because those references, taken individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest all the elements recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claim 17 for example (illustrative emphasis provided):

wherein the light redirection element has a first groove structure having a first longitudinal axis and the light guide has a second groove structure having a second longitudinal axis and facing the first groove structure, and the first and second groove structures are arranged in a configuration operable to direct light from the first light source through the display panel with a first angular distribution and light from the second light source with a second angular distribution which is different from the first angular distribution, the first longitudinal axis being substantially **parallel** to the second longitudinal axis.

As correctly noted on page 3 of the Final Office Action, Baba does not disclose or suggest a light guide having a second groove structure. Ida is cited in an attempt to remedy the deficiencies in Baba. As clearly shown in FIG 4 of Ida, the longitudinal axis of the two triangular surfaces 20-1, 20-2 are perpendicular to each other. Thus, Ida teaches away from "first longitudinal axis being substantially parallel to the second longitudinal axis," as recited in independent claims 1 and 17.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 17 are allowable. In addition, claims 2-11, 14-16 and 18-20 are allowable at least because they depend from independent claims 1 and 17, as well as for the separately patentable elements contained in each of the dependent claims.

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection(s) and/or rejection(s) of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Dicran Halajian
Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Applicant(s)
December 10, 2007

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Phone: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101